

Appln. No.: 09/822,822
Amendment dated October 24, 2005
Reply to Office Action of September 15, 2004

REMARKS

The office action of June 23, 2005, has been carefully reviewed and these remarks are responsive thereto. Reconsideration and allowance of the instant application are respectfully requested.

Claims 1-37 are pending. Claims 1-3 have been amended. Claims 9-14 and 16-21 have been withdrawn. No new matter has been entered.

Rejection over Ioannidis in view of Wang et al.

Claims 1-8, 15, and 23-35 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 over Ioannidis in view of Wang et al. Applicants traverse.

Claim 1, as amended, recites:

"A soft handoff system that transmits messages to a first base station where said first base station retransmits said messages to a second base station using IP-in-IP encapsulation between said base stations, wherein said base stations encapsulate and de-encapsulate packets and wherein a mobile terminal is an area serviceable by both said first base station and said second base station."

The Ioannidis and Wang references only show transferring packets from the central system to an active base station. There is no transmission from one base station to the other base station of the content to be sent to the mobile terminal. While soft handoff is mentioned in Wang, the soft handoff is the conventional soft handoff where packets are sent to both base stations from the central system. The combination fails to teach or suggest "a soft handoff system that transmits messages to a first base station where said first base station retransmits said messages to a second base station using IP-in-IP encapsulation." Accordingly, claim 1 is allowable over the combination.

Independent claims 2, 3, 15, 22, 23, 29, and 30 are allowable for similar reasons. Dependent claims 4-8, 24-28, and 31-35 are allowable in at least as much as being dependent on allowable independent claims.

Rejection over Ioannidis in view of Wang et al in further view of Sarkar et al.

Claims 36 and 37 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 over Ioannidis in view of Wang et al and in further view of Sarkar et al. Applicants traverse.

Appln. No.: 09/822,822
Amendment dated October 24, 2005
Reply to Office Action of September 15, 2004

Sarkar describes conventional soft handoff. There is no description that addresses the lack of teachings of the combination for the independent claims. Accordingly, claims 36 and 37 are allowable over the combination.


This paper is being submitted with a request for extension of time. If any additional fees are required or if an overpayment is made, the Commissioner is authorized to debit or credit our Deposit Account No. 19-0733, accordingly.

All rejections having been addressed, applicants respectfully submit that the instant application is in condition for allowance, and respectfully solicits prompt notification of the same.

Respectfully submitted,

BANNER & WITCOFF, LTD.
1001 G Street, N.W.
Eleventh Floor
Washington, D.C. 20001-4597
(202) 824 3000

By:


Christopher R. Glembocki
Registration No. 38,800

Dated: October 24, 2005